

# THE EXAMINER.

F. COSBY,  
JOHN H. HEYWOOD,  
NOBLE BUTLER,  
EDITORS.

LOUISVILLE: NOV. 11, 1848.

We send, occasionally, a number of the *Examiner* to persons who are not subscribers, in the hope that by a perusal of it, they may be induced to subscribe.

**To Subscribers.**  
Many of our subscribers have failed to send us their first year's subscription. We earnestly request those in arrears for the first and second year, to forward the amount due to us, without further delay.

**JAMES S. RANKIN**, of this city, is our traveling agent for Kentucky, and is authorized to procure subscribers and make collections for the *Examiner*.

**Encouraging.**  
An intelligent and influential correspondent in the interior of the State says: "Of the thirty-eight subscribers at this place, twenty-two are slaveholders. They own, according to the tax-book of the commissioner, two hundred and seven slaves—two of them, together, own sixty-eight slaves. These men, excepting one, are all very warm for gradual emancipation; that one is for it if he can be brought to see that it is practicable." Mr. Geo. W. Johnson, will find but few among intelligent slaveholders willing to subscribe to his doctrines. Almost every day we receive encouraging statements from various parts of the State. We are full of hope.

**The Lesson Taught by the Late Election.**  
Every observing mind must have been struck by the contrast between the campaign just ended and the campaign of '44.

Then the whole nation was alive. Every soul was on fire. Men, women and children were excited almost to insanity. During the last campaign, in a large portion of the country, instead of enthusiasm—there has been calumny, and almost lethargy.

To what is the contrast owing? Will any say that it is owing to the difference in the men who have represented the respective parties?—However it may appear to others, to us, who have been "lookers on in Vienna," this explanation seems entirely unsatisfactory. Compare the candidates of '44 with those of '48, and whatever we may think of them as individuals, we cannot see that, as party candidates, as available leaders, the standard bearers of '44 had the advantage of those of the present year. True, Mr. Clay has a hold upon his friends such as few men have ever had; but General Taylor certainly has many elements of popularity. And when we look to the other party, probably none of Mr. Polk's friends would regard him as superior to Gen. Cass. The difference in the candidates will not account for the different degrees of interest manifested in the two campaigns.

How then shall we account for the contrast? One very significant fact will help us in obtaining an explanation. With the exception of Louisiana, the only sections of the Union, in which any real excitement has been manifested, are those in which the third party has been organized and in active operation; and in these sections the only intense and genuine enthusiasm has been found in the ranks of the third party. The interest there felt by the other parties has been exhibited rather in opposition to the third party than in earnest, thrilling advocacy of their own aims and their own men.

This is a very striking fact. We adduce it, notes an indication of the wisdom of the Free Soil organization. With that organization, as a party organization, we have nothing to do. It is not for us to sit in judgment upon it.

Nor do we adduce the fact as evidence of the fitness of Mr. Van Buren to be the representative of this movement. Various opinions as to his fitness have existed even among those who have voted for him, some regarding him as the very man demanded by the times, while others have regretted that another was not selected as the standard bearer.

We present the fact simply as affording us a clue to the explanation desired. And it does seem to us to afford the clue. For what is the fact? Why, simply this. That in an election of great importance, the election of a man to fill the responsible office of President of this vast Republic, with few exceptions the only intense enthusiasm manifested, has been exhibited by a party which had not the most remote prospect of success, which, in truth, did not propose success, at least, present success, as its end.

This fact, we repeat, is very significant. It furnishes an explanation for the want of burning enthusiasm in the two great political parties of our country. It shows that the public mind and heart are deeply interested in a cause, of which neither of the candidates of the two parties, however worthy as men, was regarded as the special representative. That cause is the cause of human freedom, the cause which makes the great heart of mankind throb with fervent pulsations, and no man, whatever his talents or distinction, can kindle intense, undying enthusiasm, unless he be regarded as its living embodiment, its genuine representative. But the man, whom the heart of mankind can instinctively recognize as truly identified with the cause of freedom, that heart will enshrine in its holy of holies. It will not matter whether he comes, or what name he bears. As the man of the age, he will be hailed and revered.

In Europe and in America the question of freedom is in truth the only question. Other subjects may awaken temporary interest, but it is altogether a secondary interest; while the enthusiasm kindled by liberty burns with a constant and ever-brightening flame. That enthusiasm cannot be repressed. It must, it will have manifestation. The day has gone by in which the question of bank or no bank, tariff or free-trade can take precedence of the cause of freedom. That cause is henceforward to be the leading cause, and all other subjects will be regarded as possessed of value only according to their power to advance or retard the cause of freedom, the progress and triumph of liberty. By this, the organization of political parties is hereafter to be determined, and according to their fidelity or want of fidelity to this great cause, will our leading men gain or lose the confidence of their fellow-citizens. In truth, the men found faithful to the interests of liberty will be the only leading men; all other men will be led or left.

We speak of parties as destined to be organized on this new basis. We do not mean, for we do not believe, that these newly organized parties will be sectional parties, Northern and Southern parties. The cause of liberty knows not North or South; and it has foes alike in one and the other section, and it will invite to its ranks the true-hearted wherever they may be found. That invitation will be heard and responded to with joy by thousands and hundreds of thousands in every portion of our beloved land, who, forgetful of old associations, will rejoice to hail as a brother every genuine friend of liberty and humanity.

**Are not Resolutions.**  
The Watchman and Observer says: In conversation with a worthy and sensible gentleman at the Synod of Virginia, on the insufficiency of mere resolutions, said he, "I have read a book called the Acts of the Apostles. I have not seen their book of resolutions yet."

**Dense Population.**  
Mr. Johnson, in his address to the citizens of Scott county, uses the following language: "To compensate us for these great evils, what benefit do the advocates of this measure propose? What is it that they want? Is it a moral love and admiration of Ohio and Massachusetts? Who has ever before considered a dense population as the essential element of happiness? Herebefore it has been considered an evil. It is one, most certainly, when the population presses closely up to the means of support. I would think if each man had more land, he would be better off; and if he had better wages, he would be more independent. Wealth, through all time, will have followers to persuade mankind into measures which subject labor to capital. This has been effected in England, and every patriot must regret that the system is hastening to perfect its growth in America."

Mr. Johnson reminds us of the man who, having discovered that excess in eating produces many bad effects, resolves to give up eating altogether. He has learned that "when the population presses closely up to the means of support," this state of things is an evil, and he seems to infer that every country should do all in its power to prevent any increase of population. He probably has before his mind some of those crowded countries of the old world, in which the overtasked earth refuses to furnish what is demanded of her. Because a neighbor has burned up his house by having fire all over the floor, he would freeze to death for fear of a conflagration.

But we beg Mr. Johnson's pardon. It is not merely the dense population of some of the countries of the old world that he fears—he shudders when he looks at Massachusetts and Ohio. The love of such a degree of denseness of population as exists in those States, he considers insanity—"an insane love of Massachusetts and Ohio." He looks across the river where thriving cities are springing up from the earth, where an industrious population is covering the ground with gardens, where railroads groan under the weight of the produce which is carried over them, and his heart is filled with gloom. He sees death making himself comfortable in every new building, and families hiding themselves in the fields of waving wheat. The apparent prosperity of the State is beautiful only to the eyes of ordinary men; he looks through the disguise of the vile Duesen, and sees her as she is—a foul, ill-favored witch. Some goddess has unsealed his eyes, as Venus did those of *Æneas*—in our own vernacular, "his eyes have been skinned."

It is hard to speak of such notions in a serious manner; but we will make the attempt. In regard to population, as well as everything else, there is a "golden mean." There is the "too little," and the "too much." It is an evil to have a country so crowded with inhabitants that it cannot furnish the means of subsistence. But man is a social being, and requires the aid of society for the cultivation of his higher nature, and for the attainment of those things which contribute to the enjoyment of life. No sparsely settled country can enjoy the advantages of civilization, or, of itself, become civilized. The light of civilization consists of rays reflected backward and forward from one body to another through an infinite number. Each ray is at first a faint glimmer, but, unlike the rays of the sun, it acquires new splendor by being reflected. It was in the populous country of Greece that philosophy and the arts flourished in ancient times. In a country with few inhabitants there can be no schools, which are the fountains of knowledge. Such a country must be destitute of facilities for traveling, which is another means of increasing knowledge. It is in populous countries that "men shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased."

According to Mr. Johnson's principle, Robinson Crusoe's island was the most prosperous country in the world, and Robinson Crusoe the happiest of men. He had land enough, and no one would have persecuted him, like Oliver Twist, to ask for "more." He was so ignorant of what constitutes true prosperity and happiness, that he would have been willing to give away some of his land to "actual settlers." Mr. Johnson's principle is expressed in the most absolute way—"I would think if each man had more land, he would be better off." We would think so, too; for some men have so much land that they would be better off the land than on it. This is a very poor joke, we confess; but if a joke cannot be made of such doctrines, we do not know what else can. We wish our readers to bear in mind, too, that if the joke is a very poor one, we had to make it of very poor material.

The proud baron of the dark ages believed that if he had more land, he would be "better off," and he strove to acquire more land, and covered it with degraded serfs. A change took place his land was distributed, and intelligence and happiness took the place of ignorance and misery. Too much land in the possession of a few is the cause of much of the misery in Europe. When a few individuals in a country begin to get "more land," those who surround them are generally "off," whether they are "better off," or not. This process of getting "more land" has been going on for some time in Kentucky. We know of places where fifteen or twenty years ago there were many small farms, and where they have all been swallowed up, one after another by the large farms around them, which were continually crying for "more."

**Mr. Thomas' Lecture.**  
This gentleman has delivered two lectures this week. The first, upon Wesley, and the other upon Whitfield. We were surprised and grieved to see so few persons in attendance upon these lectures. When we remember the immense audiences that visited the exhibitions of the Fakir of Ava, or the negro opera, and compare them with the little handful of people that attended Mr. T.'s excellent addresses, we cannot draw other than a very unfavorable inference in regard to the taste of our citizens. It may be that the subjects were thought uninteresting, but it must be remembered that Mr. T. does not give mere biographical sketches of his subjects, but enlarges upon the smaller points of character, as detailed in anecdotes of private history, and incidental traits of life. Mr. Thomas is a chaste and excellent speaker, and draws to his use all the resemblances in character and situation that can be found in history and biography; making a lecture full of taste, replete with knowledge, and conveying useful information with amusement, and pleasure with interest. He lectures again this evening upon the life and character of Sumnerfield, and we sincerely hope to see an audience sufficiently large to justify Mr. T. in giving another course of lectures upon more popular subjects.

**Orphan's Fair.**  
The Fair for the benefit of St. Vincent's Orphan Asylum, will be held in the Old Fellows Hall, on the 20th inst. Extensive preparations have been made, and we are sure that the benevolent projectors will not be disappointed in their expectations. The object is one which commands itself so strongly to the humane and generous, that we feel that any appeal to the liberality and sympathy of our citizens would be a work of supererogation—the announcement is enough.

The Secretary of the Treasury has given orders for the payment of the Mexican indemnity. Eight hundred thousand will be paid out to N. York; four hundred thousand in Boston, and three hundred thousand in Philadelphia—making an aggregate of \$1,500,000.

**To the Mechanics and Working Men of the State of Kentucky—No. 112.**

**REPLY TO A. B. C.**  
In the last *Examiner*, we gave a number of statistical facts proving the assertion of A. B. C., in relation to the comparative rate of wages in the free and slave States; utterly erroneous and unfounded. We might enlarge much on this subject—and show what would be the necessary consequences flowing from this main proposition of A. B. C. provided it was true. Every man possessing the slightest business knowledge must see, that if labor, which is the principal element of cost in most manufactured articles, is from 30 to 100 per cent. higher in Kentucky than in Indiana, (the cost of living being about the same) all foreign capital; which would otherwise flow equally to the two States, must necessarily go to Indiana, for the simple reason that the 30 to 100 per cent. lower wages paid in Indiana, would be so much additional profit to the capitalist. For example, if in the manufacture of carriages and wagons, I can get workmen for \$1 per day in Madison, Ia., and have to pay these same workmen \$1 50 per day in Frankfort, Ky., I shall, of course, invest my capital in Madison.

This illustration will hold good of every other branch of business, and would, apart from the facts in the case, prove the entire fallacy of the argument of A. B. C. But this is not the worst aspect of the case presented. Under the stimulus of large profits, the Indiana manufacturer would lower his prices. The Kentucky manufacturer leaving the mechanics of his own State to shift for themselves goes to Indiana to make cheaper purchases. The Kentucky mechanic must then do one of three things—remove from the State, lower his prices, or starve. Perfect freedom of exchange and inter-communication between the States must equalize both wages and profits—this is a fixed law of political economy, from which there is no escape. If this reasoning is correct, we may safely predicate on it this statement, to-wit: that if "wages are from 30 to 100 per cent. higher in Kentucky, than in the adjacent free States," foreign capital seeking investment must go to the free States in preference to Kentucky, and capital at present invested in manufactures in Kentucky, must go also, or be lost. We respectfully ask the advocates of perpetual slavery to examine this matter carefully.

We appeal directly to you fellow-mechanics who are employers—if you must (according to this abominable doctrine of perpetual slavery) pay from 30 to 100 per cent. more for labor, than is paid in the free States, can you compete with Cincinnati, Madison and Pittsburgh? Did you ever know a southern planter so entirely disinterested, as to give you knowingly from 30 to 100 per cent. more for an article than the same article can be purchased for in Pittsburgh or Cincinnati? Have we not, over and over again, been told that we must be prepared to come down to Cincinnati and Pittsburgh prices or lose our custom? And have we not done it? As Kentucky mechanics, shall not this now be our language, "free labor and no favors."

We appeal to you, fellow-citizens, who are journeymen and laborers—is it true that you are now getting from 30 to 100 per cent. more for your labor than you can get for the same work in the free States? Must you not, and do you not, in many parts of the State meet with the competition of slave labor—the wages of which is the plainest food, and the coarsest clothing? What "luxuries" do you and your children enjoy by reason of slavery, that free labor could not procure you? "What social or political privileges and rights" would you lose by a just system of Emancipation?

What are those "onerous burthens" which A. B. C. informs us lie so heavily on the mechanic and laborer in the free States?

We ask you in all sincerity and candor to answer these questions to yourselves, as your own judgment shall dictate. We beg of you to throw aside all appeals to your prejudices and passions, and so to act and vote on this question as you shall deem best calculated to advance the permanent interests of our beloved State. For one, we cannot doubt what those acts and that vote will be.

Again—perpetual slavery as described by A. B. C. injures the whole mechanic, the retail dealer, the trader and clerk, just as much as the other classes mentioned. An active, industrious, intelligent, wealth producing population, is, as a general rule, the great essential condition of mercantile prosperity. In order that the merchant and trader may sell his wares and goods, there must be consumers, and these consumers must have the ability to purchase. According to the argument of A. B. C., and the positive assertions of Mr. Johnson—slavery drives away these intelligent, industrious, thrifty consumers, and keeps them away; not only so, but it erects "an insuperable barrier" to prevent others from coming to fill their place.

This then being the legitimate effect of slavery as asserted by its ablest defenders—who is to cultivate our fertile soil, who is to develop and render useful our vast mineral treasures—who are to be our mechanics and manufacturers?—What is the instrument by which all the diversified forms of human industry are to be rendered actively promotive of human progress and human happiness?

Fellow-citizens, there can be but one answer to these questions, if the arguments of slavery perpetualists are correct. All these important objects are to be effected and accomplished by just such a poor, thriftless, ignorant population as slavery always has produced, and always must produce.

The wages of slavery never have developed, and they never can develop the energies of a people. Slavery cannot by possibility permit that intelligent, economical, and wealth-producing population which is so necessary for the support of a prosperous mercantile community. Mr. Johnson tells us—"A negro never works till compelled"—they will not work for you because they are "a horde of semi-civilized savages"—"savages that bear upon their bodies the mark of eternal hatred to the white man." That "negroes should do all the staiding in Kentucky"—they are entitled to that job, and understand the business well." And this, too, after all the humanizing, civilizing, and christianizing influences of perpetual slavery for the past three-quarters of a century.

Freemen of Kentucky! do you wish to see a population of this class increasing from year to year? Are all the evil influences of just such slavery as Mr. Johnson describes, to surround your children and your children's children? Can you cherish this plague-spot on the body politic, when so fair an opportunity is given you to eradicate it, root and branch? Shall all the native energy of the people of this Commonwealth be cramped by the paralyzing influences of slavery, when by one vigorous effort, they can shake it off, and stand forth in the manly proportions and beautiful symmetry of healthful freedom? Think you that a vote for Emancipation will ever be contemplated with feelings of personal regret, or as instrumental in producing a public injury? Is it possible that the overwhelming majority of the wise and good men of the past and present generation, who have borne their united testimony to the political, social, and moral, evil influences of slavery were mistaken? We beseech you by all the love you bear our noble State, to ponder these questions well before you give your vote towards rendering perpetual the curse of negro slavery.

We will now examine briefly some of the other positions of A. B. C. He asserts that "slavery puts many luxuries within the reach of the mechanic and laborer, which he cannot afford in the free States." We are not informed what the luxuries are—not a single one is named. We suppose the writer intended this assertion as an inference from his first proposition, and that the luxuries enjoyed by the white mechanic and laborer in the slave States, are the result of the increased wages which he receives.

We have proved that this 30 to 80 per cent. higher wages has no foundation in fact, therefore, there can be no increased luxuries as derived therefrom. If the mechanics and working men of Kentucky enjoy any luxuries by virtue of slavery, not possessed by their brethren in Ohio, the fact would certainly have been manifested by some outward signs of comfort and prosperity—there would necessarily become evidences of increased refinement, intelligence and taste. We should see more architectural display in our public and private edifices—houses more elegantly furnished—less necessity for constant labor—increased progress in the Arts and Sciences—more liberal provisions for public and private education. In a word, all these unmistakable signs of increasing wealth, and progressive prosperity, which cannot fail to strike the most insensitive observer.

Now we put the question in all plainness and sincerity to A. B. C., to Mr. Johnson, and to all others who agree with them—Is comparing Virginia with New York, Maryland with Pennsylvania, and Kentucky with Ohio, in all those outward signs of prosperity and progress which we have just enumerated, is the comparison for or against the slave States? And if, upon a fair and candid examination, you shall come to the conclusion that the comparison is decidedly in favor of the free States, is it not your duty to sustain the policy of Emancipation?

The third assertion of A. B. C. is this:—"slavery elevates the social and political condition of the working man, and lessens those distinctions in society which in the free States are found to be so onerous and oppressive to the poor man."

We are not informed as to the process by which slavery carries on its elevating influences in politics and social life, and for the life of us, we are unable to conjecture what it is. We are equally in the dark to relation to those "onerous burthens" so oppressive to the poor man in the free States. We are somewhat astonished that these poor men and mechanics in the free States, being in full possession of that powerful instrument called "universal suffrage," have not exchanged those "onerous burthens" now pressing on them so heavily, for others more easy to be borne; indeed, they might adopt the opinion of A. B. C., establish perpetual slavery as part of their organic law, and part with freedom and their "onerous burthens" together. Some of the free States which were once blessed with slavery, have, within the past few years, amended their State constitutions, but we do not recollect that any of them have proposed to re-establish slavery. If the mechanics and poor men of those free States could only have been made sensible of the social and political privilege they might prepare for themselves by re-establishing slavery, they certainly would have done it. Perhaps after reading the communication of A. B. C., they will emigrate to Kentucky.

We may group the fourth and fifth assertions of A. B. C. together. "All the cheap labor of the South is performed by negroes." If Emancipation comes, the whites would from necessity be compelled to perform this cheap labor, and by so doing, form a lower white gradation than now exists in Kentucky.

To this we reply, that the first assertion, to-wit: that all the cheap labor of the South is performed by negroes—is entirely erroneous. Every observing man knows that a large proportion of the cheap labor of this State, is done by white men. In many portions of the State white men are employed in agricultural labor, and other labor of the cheapest kind. There are also very many slaves in some parts of the State employed in the mechanic arts, especially in the country and in small towns. This may not exist to the same extent in Kentucky, as in the States farther south; still, it does exist in all most all the small towns in the interior of Kentucky, to a sufficient extent, materially to diminish the wages of mechanics and laborers.—Every man knows this to be the fact. There are instances within the present knowledge of all of us, in which master mechanics have become rich by the labor of their slaves. This must always be the case under the present order of things, and we know no good reason why it should not. If the law should prescribe to the slaveholder the occupation in which the slave should be employed, there would soon be an end of slavery. If slavery is to be perpetual in Kentucky, then every man in the State who earns his bread by any occupation that slaves can be taught to perform, must expect to work for wages but slightly in advance of that received by slaves. We know of slaves that are good Blacksmiths, Bricklayers, Plasterers, Carpenters and Painters—and we suppose there are other mechanical branches in which they are employed. It is folly to deny that white mechanics do not feel this competition. It always has been the case, and it always must be.

We therefore assert as an incontrovertible truth, that, while slavery exists in Kentucky, the wages of freemen cannot be much in advance of the wages of slaves. If any of the advocates of perpetual slavery, who have just now taken such an interest in the welfare of our laborers and mechanics are inclined to deny the truth of this proposition, we shall be pleased to discuss the matter with them.

It is, then, not true that all the cheap labor of Kentucky is performed by slaves, and if the performance of cheap, but necessary labor, degrades industrious and intelligent white men to the social condition of slaves, then, according to the advocate of perpetual slavery, are we, the great mass of the industrious class, already degraded, and slavery has done it. Right glad are we that A. B. C. has (unintentionally, no doubt) placed in our hands the strongest possible argument against the policy of perpetual slavery. In what State of this Union, not cursed by slavery, would a public writer dare affirm that the performance of cheap but necessary labor, degrades those who perform it? What evidence can A. B. C. produce, showing the fact that, in the free States of Ohio and Indiana, industrious, but poor white men and women, are reduced to the degraded social position of our slaves? In what free State of this Union is the performance of necessary household duties, considered a degrading task? By what mental process has A. B. C. satisfied his mind that, because the law of slavery compels negroes to perform certain work, necessary to be done, therefore, FREEMEN voluntarily performing the same work, are to be looked upon as "degraded menials"?

Is it by such arguments and statements as these that the intelligent working-men, and the hardy yeomanry of the State are to be induced to support the policy of slavery perpetuation? Is slavery so utterly and entirely indefensible that its ablest supporters are compelled to condemn it by the weakness and impotency of their own advocacy? Surely, surely, then, those who are laboring for Emancipation should take courage and press onward.

If perpetualists can furnish no better argument for their policy, than the fact that IT DEGRADES LABOR, then ought we, to band ourselves together as brothers for its final overthrow—and determine never to cease our labors till we have accomplished our purpose.

In reply to the objection of A. B. C. in relation to the "aristocracy of wealth" as existing in the free States, we remark, that wealth creates its own "aristocracy" all the world over—but in the United States it is an aristocracy to which every man may aspire, and the humblest man may hope to attain. The best corrective for the oppressive aristocracy of wealth, is the omnipotence of intelligence—and that generally diffused, has least to fear from the corrupting influence of riches. Whether slavery or freedom best promotes the general diffusion of intelligence, and develops those distinguishing traits of character which render all classes of people virtuous, wise, and happy, every one must judge for himself. A. B. C. cannot certainly complain of the fact, that in the free as well as the slave States, men are always ready to avail themselves of the advantages and immunities which wealth generally gives—and we are somewhat surprised that so intelligent a citizen should expect the "human nature" of the free States to be very essentially different from that same human nature as found in the slave States.

In conclusion, we would respectfully but earnestly ask all classes of our fellow-citizens to give that attention to this subject which its paramount importance demands; it is one, not secondary in its final consequences to any that can possibly be presented to us for discussion. The value of every man's labor and every man's property is to be affected by it. Our interests, both for the present and the future are intimately bound up in it. We should examine it in all its phases and all its aspects. We should endeavor to divest our minds of all passion and prejudice, and not permit ourselves to be drawn aside by false issues. The question, and the only question is this: "What shall be the future organic law of the State in relation to the institution of slavery?"

If slavery be a blessing we should certainly vote for its perpetuation. But, if on the contrary we believe it to be "evil, only evil, and that continually," then should we use our best efforts for its extirpation by such means and in such a manner as will best promote Public Justice and Private Right. MECHANIC.

**To Geo. W. Johnson Esq., of Scott Co. Ky.**

SIR:—Your address to the citizens of Scott county, published in the Georgetown Herald of the 18th inst., contains some propositions which deserve to be calmly considered, especially at the present time. Great organic changes are contemplated in our government, and we owe it to ourselves, to the world at large, and eminent to posterity, to hear with attention, examine with candor, and determine with reason, every question proposed for discussion. This, sir, is no time for the turbulence of passion, or the display of hot temper; let us cherish quiet.

You announce yourself "the uncompromising enemy of Emancipation;" and say, "the question shall be decided by the dictates of an enlightened Philanthropy, Reason and Religion." Reversing the order, you advance what you have to say on the religious bearings of the question, first, and assert the rightfulness of slavery from the fact that the Great Master of morals did not condemn it, though existing at the time of his ministry throughout the Roman Empire. This silence of Him who "spoke as never man spake;" if construed in favor of the rightfulness of slavery, must satisfy all the concomitant circumstances, and therefore, the slave trade, both foreign and domestic, is right—the separation of husband and wife no wrong—and taking the life of the slave no sin in the sight of Heaven—for the power to do all these, existed in connection with Roman slavery. "He saw domestic slavery in its worst form, and he gave it his sanction." That is, he not only gave slavery his sanction, but he gave his sanction to "its worst form." I can but think such a proposition monstrous—nearly approaching blasphemy—and charitably hope you will turn to the New Testament, and refresh your memory of the Master's teaching. I suppose that the Saviour of men taught by general principles, rather than by special precepts. "As ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them." This is a sufficient answer to your assertion. No casuistry can reconcile it and slavery.

The representation you have been pleased to give of the teaching of Dr. Wayland, Mr. Giddings, and others, may be true, but it is aside from the matter. It may be true that in the estimation of Heaven, "George Washington, of Virginia, was quite as good a man as Hale, of New Hampshire"—and your cause derive from it no support; for you must be aware of the fact, that "the Father of his country" was as decidedly anti-slavery as Mr. Hale; and that in his last will and testament he emancipated all his slaves. He was no sickly sentimental enthusiast, but anti-slavery non-resistance.

Your argument, based on what you are pleased to denominate, "the inferiority of the African, morally, physically, and mentally," to the white man, and his association "with him by Divine appointment for mutual service and improvement," is remarkable principally, as showing the origin of slavery, "by Divine appointment;" yes, it is! So you say—but where is the evidence—we demand proof. You are equally explicit as to the purposes of slavery—"Mutual service and improvement!" Do you mean that they mutually serve and improve each other? That will not do; for what can a white man learn from stupid negroes—"morally, physically and mentally" his inferiors?—Your meaning must be, therefore, that the negro renders all the service, and receives all the improvement. Dr. Caldwell once said in a lecture on horse-racing, "If it improves the breed of horses, it corrupts that of man." So of slavery. If it improves the negro, it corrupts and degrades the white man, and hence its removal is highly desirable.

Are you sure, sir, that you have done the negro justice in denying that he has ever accomplished anything in literature and the arts? A gentleman of your erudition, must be familiar with the fact mentioned by the historian, *Sancionotho*, that alphabetical writing was first introduced by the grandson of Ham, who, according to your own showing, was a negro.

But it is unnecessary to travel back to a period so remote, you must be familiar with the fact that *Freidig*, of Vienna, was an excellent architect. *Freidig* was a negro! *Hannibal* a colonel of artillery in the Russian service, was deeply skilled in the mathematical and physical sciences. *Hannibal* was a negro! *Lidat*, of the Isle of France, was so deeply versed in various branches of learning, that he was made a member of the French Academy. *Lidat* was a negro. *Arno* was a negro. *Vasa* and *Ignatius Sancho*, were negroes! *Phillis Wheatley* was a respectable poetess. *Phillis Wheatley* was a negro! *Toussaint L'Ouverture*, was General in Chief of the armies of St. Domingo from 1797 to 1801 and was the remark of one competent to judge in such matters, Golwin, that the West India Islands, since their discovery by Columbus, could not boast a single name which deserved comparison with that of *Toussaint L'Ouverture*. And *Wendworth* has embodied his name in immortal verse. *Toussaint L'Ouverture* was a negro! *Henry Christophe*, King of a part of Hayti, devised and carried into execution a plan for the education of every child in his dominions. He founded a university and introduced all the usual professions, with one of sculpture and painting. He devised a liberal form of Govern-

ment for his people, but his premature death prevented its being carried out. *Henry Christophe* was the son of a slave, a negro, "black as jet." *Roberto*, the present Governor of the Republic of Liberia, writes his annual and other messages with strength and elegance, and performs all the duties of his office with skill and energy. *Roberto* is a negro! But I will not trouble you further with this detail for I feel that it must disfigure to you, and an apology may be due for the heavy tax levied on your time and patience; if so, I have only to say, that the "unhappy pretenses to historic knowledge, who now infect the earth," need to be taught a modesty befitting their attainments. But before I leave this topic I cannot forbear to hint that you must be familiar with the fact, that travelers of distinction have affirmed that there are *free States*, and large commercial towns and cities scattered over the continent of Africa, whose sovereigns are negroes, whose armies are negroes—whose people are negroes—cities in which trade and manufactures seem to be equally esteemed and protected. These are remarkable facts in the history of the negro race which the *negro* "pretenses to historic knowledge" could not overlook. When the ostrich buries his head in the sand, he does not eclipse the sun, but only deceives himself.

The facts detailed in this article appear to me, sir, at variance with the postulate you have so confidently announced. "They have been upon the earth, like the beasts of the field, like the contemporary races of tigers and baboons, and have left not one trace of their existence, except in their posterity. In the wide arch of the sciences and arts there is nothing—absolutely nothing, traceable to them to mark their superiority over the brute creation, much less to indicate equality with the intellectual white man!" When I read this singular passage, I could but think you had written it immediately after a perusal of *Montesquieu's* chapter on slavery, and deeply impressed with the truth of the sentiment, "it is impossible for us to suppose these creatures to be men; because, allowing them to be a man, suspicion would follow that our selves are not Christians!" you nobly resolved to vindicate your claims to Christianity, by degrading the whole African race to a level with the "brute creation." Your devotion to Christianity excites in me a sentiment of wonder and admiration, while your sacrifice excites in me a sentiment akin to horror, for it is a sacrifice of truth, justice and humanity.

The ancients, we are told, believed that the face was always the index of the mind. Modern physiologists have gone a step farther, contending that a fine form, perfect in all its parts, cannot contain a crooked or imperfect mind. *Thomas Hope*, Esq., F. R. S., in his elaborate treatise on the "Origin and Prospects of Man," confidently asserts, that the genus, man, comprises distinct species, each derived from its own peculiar parent stock, discriminated one from the other by a comparative scale of excellence both in physical and intellectual capacity; the former, if not determining the latter, at least being its unerring index—and that between these several races is a boundary; not only distinct and well defined, but impassable; so that a *Cafre* or *Samoyed* could no more, by whatever pains in education or discipline be elevated to the comprehension of European science, than the dullest of brutes be trained to the sagacity of the Elephant." You, sir, seem to have adopted the opinion of this ingenious speculator, and mistaking the sarcasm of *Montesquieu* for a sober statement, concluded, "it is hardly to be believed that God, who is a wise being should place a soul, especially a good soul, in such a black ugly body." But the facts to which I have already called your attention, as well as numerous others, prove the theory false, and demonstrate that the negro is capable of a high degree of knowledge. Suppose, sir, we had no facts to appeal to—I would then inquire; has the experiment been made? Has any effort been put forth to elevate and refine the minds of the unfortunate negro? Have christian nations—has christian Kentucky sought to pour upon it the light of science? Have you, sir, holding as you do, learning in such exalted estimation, established schools for the education of your servants? Have you sought to carry out the "purpose of Deity for the good of man," by bringing the means of mental improvement within the reach of the negro, and encouraging him to the struggle? I fear sir, the answer to these inquiries will reflect but little credit upon the "proud, and noble, generous, enthusiastic, and glorious people" of Kentucky, and the entire South.

What account can we give of our stewardship, when after a lapse of two hundred years association with the negro for "his improvement" we have made him only a "semi-civilized savage." When, sir, agreeably to your theory of the dispensations of an all-wise Providence, He condescended to the "intellectual white man," the negro race, it was for "his guidance, protection and improvement," and he having received his *ward*—handed him the plough and spade, and bade him toil—but the temples of science were closed against him, and the stern voice of the "intellectual white man," said, "and now also, let him put forth his hand and take of the tree of knowledge and become wise like unto us, let us make a law against it." And that law like a flaming sword turns every way to bar his passage to the tree of knowledge. So that generally, whatever knowledge of letters they acquire, is by stealth. This is the fruitage of the planting, more bitter than the fabled "apples of Sodom." "Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just, and that his justice cannot sleep forever." Who, in the face of the position you have assumed, and the facts which are known and read of all men, will not echo the sentiment of the immortal Jefferson! And sir, had the "intellectual white man," been true to his trust, what a host of African names might have been clustered in the "arch of the sciences," and though no *Franklin* might have appeared to draw the lightning from heaven—no *Newton* to teach us a new philosophy—no *Columbus* to open a passage to another continent, no *Fulton* to invent a steamboat—for you know sir, the world has had but one *Franklin*, one *Newton*, one *Columbus*, one *Fulton*—still there might have been those capable of comprehending the philosophy of the first, and appreciating the discoveries of the last. But enough of this. Africa has now artisans capable of forming a "bottom"—of smelting-ores, and manufacturing their instruments of agriculture and war. And how very little do we know of her! Comparatively nothing.

Suppose, sir, we allow that the negro is as inferior as you affirm—does it follow that slavery is right? Do you verily teach that superior strength of mind, &c., confers the right upon a nation to subject to its will and pleasure a people less favored? This is certainly the bearing of your address, and is unquestionably the foundation of the slave system. It is the doctrine that "power confers right," which, if true of nations, is also true of individuals. The strong man may enslave his weak brother—the cultivated mind busy itself in contriving shackles for the ignorant and rude! Were I to denounce this, the *highwayman's* argument you would perhaps feel offended, but you will excuse me. When I affirm I know for it no better name. Heaven help the feeble when the correctness of your moral code shall be recognised by society!

Emancipation is not so impracticable as you suppose, even allowing that it "turned loose upon society" 185,000 negroes—for it can be shown, conclusively that it has been effected on a large scale. I am indebted to Dr. John Mason Good's Lecture on "The Varieties of the Human Race," for the facts stated in this paragraph.

the soil without those scenes of bloodshed and carnage which you have so eloquently portrayed.

The idea of their abandoning themselves to idleness and crime, is inconsistent with your own philosophy. You call them "semi-civilized, the rudeness of barbarism. This is encouraging, for you tell us in another place, with direct reference to this people—"The race of improvement OCEAN NEVER ENDS." It is contrary to the close of the revolutionary war, there were more than 2000 slaves in the British army who had fled from their masters. The British Government settled them in Nova Scotia—where they led harmless lives and gained the reputation of an industrious and honest people from their white neighbors. A few years afterwards some fourteen hundred of them volunteered to form a colony at Sierra Leon, on the western coast of Africa. They, or their descendants, are still there, most of them in independent, and some of them in affluent circumstances. At the close of the war of 1812, the British Government found itself similarly situated in regard to a large number of slaves who had been retained from their owners. They resolved to settle in Trinidad as free laborers. The planters objected "that free negroes never would work," and if these were settled among them, they would support themselves "by plunder." The Governor of the Island, Sir Ralph Woodford, resisted the outcry of the planters, rescued the negroes, and settled them where he supposed the experiment could be most safely made. What was the result? These persons, formerly slaves among us, conducted themselves with much propriety, and pursued their callings industriously, that the planters were